



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,563	04/22/2004	Geoffrey G. Hammett	A-9215	6343
5642	7590	01/13/2006	EXAMINER	
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044				LA, ANH V
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2636	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ac

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,563	HAMMETT, GEOFFREY G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh V. La	2636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/22/04, 9/19/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13 and 15-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoseit in view of Gehlot.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 11, Hoseit discloses a security system comprising first and second sensors, each the sensor adapted to be elevated from a stable state corresponding with a secure environment into an elevated state corresponding with a first detection event, the system generating an alarm signal in response to one or more second detection events occurring with the system (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30). Hoseit does not disclose the sensor configured to communicate with the other sensor (claim 1), each sensor communicating current state status to the other sensor (claim 6), the first sensor being at one premises and the second sensor being at a second premises (claim 11). Gehlot teaches the use of a sensor configured to communicate with the other sensor and each sensor communicating current state status to the other sensor, the first sensor being at one premises and the second sensor being at a second premises (abstract). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the sensor configured to communicate with the other sensor and each sensor communicating current state status to the other

sensor, the first sensor being at one premises and the second sensor being at a second premises to the system of Hoseit as taught by Gehlot for the purpose of elevating the other sensors into the elevated state.

Regarding claim 2, Hoseit discloses one of the sensors generating the alarm signal in response to detecting the second detection event (abstract, col. 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 3, Hoseit discloses one of the sensors generating the alarm signal in response to detecting the other of the sensors detecting the second detection event (abstract, col. 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 4, Hoseit discloses either of the sensors generating the alarm signal corresponding with the second detection event occurring at either of the sensor abstract, col. 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 5 Hoseit discloses the alarm signal being generated as a result of both the sensors being in the elevated sate and one of the sensor being elevated state detecting the second detection event.

Regarding claim 7, Hoseit discloses a central controller 12 (microcontroller).

Regarding claim 8, Hoseit discloses the central controller generating the alarm signal as a result of the same said sensor detecting the first and second detection events (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 9, Hoseit discloses the central controller generating the alarm signal as a result of different said sensors detecting the first and second detection events (column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 10, Hoseit discloses the first and second sensors being at one premises (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 12, Hoseit discloses the first detection event occurring at one premises and the second detection event occurring at another premises (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 13, Hoseit clearly discloses a network.

Regarding claim 15, Hoseit discloses the alarm signal being generated in response to one of the sensors detecting the second detection event and one of the sensors detecting another the second detection event (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 16, Hoseit discloses the second detection event being detected by one of the sensor and the other of the second detection events being detected by the other said sensor (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 17, Hoseit discloses both of the second detection events being detected by the same sensor (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 18, Hoseit discloses both said sensors detecting the same second detection event (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claims 19, 23, Hoseit discloses a method for providing security comprising the steps of providing a plurality of sensors (first and second sensors), elevating one of the sensors from a stable state corresponding with a secure environment into an elevated state corresponding with a first detection event, and generating an alarm signal in response to one or more second detection event

occurring at one of the sensors in the elevated state. Hoseit does not disclose the sensor configured to communicate with the other sensor (claim 1), each sensor communicating current state status to the other sensor (claim 6). Gehlot teaches the use of a sensor configured to communicate with the other sensor and each sensor communicating current state status to the other sensor (abstract). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the sensor configured to communicate with the other sensor and each sensor communicating current state status to the other sensor to the system of Hoseit as taught by Gehlot for the purpose of elevating the other sensors into the elevated state.

Regarding claim 20, Hoseit discloses one of the sensors generating the alarm signal in response to detecting the second detection event (abstract, col. 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 21, Hoseit discloses one of the sensors generating the alarm signal in response to detecting the other of the sensors detecting the second detection event (abstract, col. 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 22, Hoseit discloses either of the sensors generating the alarm signal corresponding with the second detection event occurring at either of the sensor abstract, col. 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 24, Hoseit discloses a central controller 12 (microcontroller).

Regarding claim 25, Hoseit discloses the central controller generating the alarm signal as a result of the same said sensor detecting the first and second detection events (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 26, Hoseit discloses the central controller generating the alarm signal as a result of different said sensors detecting the first and second detection events (column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 27, Hoseit discloses the first detection event occurring at one premises and the second detection event occurring at another premises (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 28, Hoseit clearly discloses a network.

Regarding claim 29, Hoseit discloses the alarm signal being generated in response to one of the sensors detecting the second detection event and one of the sensors detecting another the second detection event (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 30, Hoseit discloses the second detection event being detected by one of the sensor and the other of the second detection events being detected by the other said sensor (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 31, Hoseit discloses both of the second detection events being detected by the same sensor (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 32, Hoseit discloses both said sensors detecting the same second detection event (abstract, column 83, lines 10-30).

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoseit in view of Gehlot as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Clark.

Regarding claim 14, Hoseit as modified by Gehlot discloses all the claimed subject matters as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose a two-way cable. Clark teaches the use of a two-way cable (col. 3, lines 30-35). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a two-way cable to the system of Hoseit (as modified by Gehlot) as taught by Clark for the purpose of transmitting and receiving data.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Markwell, Wang, and William teach security systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh V. La whose telephone number is (571) 272-2970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANH V. LA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Anh V La
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2636

AI
November 29, 2005